

REMARKS

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,138,130 (Adler) in view of a publication by Jennings entitled, "Using Access 95" (Jennings).

The Examiner is asserting that Adler teaches all of the means of claim 1 and is further asserting that Jennings teaches "the one piece of output two-dimensional data having a different configuration from the input two-dimensional data." According to the present invention, the data has a different configuration after the performed operation than it had before the performed operation. See Page 10 of the Specification, first full paragraph. See also Figure 4, for example.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Adler in view of Jennings, as neither Adler nor Jennings, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the feature identified by the above-quoted language.

In the example discussed in Adler, the objects in cells A1 through A5 are added together, and the sum of the objects is outputted to cell A6. Rather than inputting two-dimensional data and performing an operation that will output one piece of two-dimensional data, as is recited in claim 1 of the present application, Adler discloses in Columns 24 and 25 that a single value in a cell is calculated. Adler allows the operation results presented in cell A6 to adapt to different types of objects that are included in cells A1 through A5, but the configuration of the cells remains the same. Changing the configuration of the cells in the two-dimensional data would not be possible in Adler. This is in contrast to claim 1 of the present application, which recites, in relevant part, "the one piece of output two-dimensional data having a different configuration from the input two-dimensional data."

Moreover, the Examiner has implicitly acknowledged that Adler does not teach or suggest the above-identified feature by introducing the Jennings reference. See Office Action, item 10 D. Jennings also does not teach or suggest the above-identified feature. Jennings discloses assignment and comparison operators for comparing values of two operands and returning logical values. See Jennings, page 288, last paragraph. Unlike the present invention, Jennings simply calculates a single value and places it into a cell. No reconfiguration is performed, period.

As asserted by the Examiner, SQL join operators are known in the art. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that when a join operation is used, it essentially simply merges groups of data. Unlike the present invention, in a join operation, the configuration of the data

remains the same after the operation occurs.

As independent claims 5, 9, 13, and 15 recite similar language, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over the reference for the same reason offered above. As claims 2-4, 6-8 and 10-12 depend from respective independent claims, these claims are patentable for at least the reasons offered above with respect to the independent claims.

Further, since data in a spreadsheet is created without taking account of the relational model, the data cannot be used in the relational calculation without conversion. Consequently, if the spreadsheet and the relational database cooperated with each other, such cooperation would be nonsensical in terms of wide use data.

The spreadsheet shown in Fig. 27 of the application is indefinite in terms of the number of rows and the number of columns. For this reason, when the number of training seminars, for example, represented in column-wise format is altered, the number of the column changes. With respect to such data in the spreadsheet, if a macroinstruction is created so as to cooperate with the relational database using the macro function, the macroinstruction will fail to accurately operate on the similar data, which is different in its number of rows or/and number of columns. Consequently, the present invention is characterized in that the calculation to create the spreadsheet, which causes a change of the substance between the row and the column, is prepared in advance in a manner indicated by "row to column conversion" (shown in Fig. 17). It should be understood that such calculation cannot be achieved by the relational calculation. Moreover, such calculation is not realized in the macro function of the spreadsheet combined with the relational calculation.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

10 May 05

By:


Reginald D. Lucas

Registration No. 46,883

Serial No. 09/781,963

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501